

Inventor: Ms. Carolyn Batts-Gowins
Portable AC Power Supply With Multiple Uses
Serial No. 10/718,437; Filing Date November 20, 2003
Response to Office Action of May 5, 2005
Examiner: Patel, Rajnikant B.; Group Art Unit No. 2838

AMENDMENT

I. Claim Listing

1. (Original) A multiple use electrical distribution device having a housing and a handle for carrying the device, and additionally having:
 - at least one rechargeable power storage unit contained in the housing;
 - at least one standard 110 V outlet adapted to receive a electrical plug for an ordinary household appliance or device,
 - a clock circuit and LED display unit capable of displaying the current time;
 - a timer circuit and a timer switch which can cut off flow of electricity to the 110 V outlet after a predetermined amount of time; and,
 - a safety interrupt device connected to the 110 V outlet which can cut off the 110 V outlet whenever a short circuit is detected.
2. (Original) The electrical distribution device according to Claim 1 further having a 12 V outlet capable of receiving a first connector and a jumper cable having a corresponding second connector for communicating with the device at one end and a car adopter connector at the other end of the cable wherein the jumper cable can be used to jump a dead car battery, or when the vehicle is on, the vehicle will charge the electrical distribution device's rechargeable power storage unit.
3. (Original) The electrical distribution device according to Claim 1 further having a low voltage outlet capable of receiving a first connector and a jumper cable having a corresponding second connector for communicating with the device at one end and a solar panel unit connected to the other end of the cable wherein the jumper cable can be used to recharge the electrical distribution device.
4. (Original) The electrical distribution device according to Claim 1 further having a 12 V outlet capable of receiving a first connector and a jumper cable having a corresponding second connector

Inventor: Ms. Carolyn Batts-Gowins
Portable AC Power Supply With Multiple Uses
Serial No. 10/718,437; Filing Date November 20, 2003
Response to Office Action of May 5, 2005
Examiner: Patel, Rajnikant B.; Group Art Unit No. 2838

for communicating with the device and a car adapter receptacle at the other end of the device wherein a car adapter plug can communicate with the device to provide power to a cell phone anywhere.

5. (Original) The electrical distribution device according to Claim 1 wherein 2 or more such devices are provided, each having at least one physical interconnecting means communicating with its housing and at least two electrical connector means, wherein when the 2 or more electrical distribution devices are joined with their respective physical connecting means joined together and their electrical connector means are also joined together additional power and/or battery life may be provided from all of the electrical distribution devices which have been joined together.

RESPONSE

1-2.) Applicant further respectfully desires to traverse the Examiner's rejections regarding Claim 1 are unfounded on the following grounds:

Claim 1 is not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prelec (U.S. Pat. No. 5,793,185) in combination with Crass (U.S. Pat. No. 6,252,378). A 35 U.S.C. § 103 obviousness rejection places the burden on the Examiner to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. See *In re Fitch*, 23 U.S.P.Q.2d 1780, 1780 (Fed. Cir. 1992). The United States Patent and Trademark Office has defined *prima facie* unpatentability as follows:

when the information compels a conclusion that a claim is unpatentable under the preponderance of evidence, burden-of-proof standard, giving each term in the claim its broadest reasonable construction consistent with the specification, and before any consideration is given to evidence which may be submitted in an attempt to establish a contrary conclusion of patentability. *Id. citing* 37 CFR § 1.56(b)(2).

Further, the Examiner must provide,

(A) the relevant teachings of the prior art relied upon, preferably with

Inventor: Ms. Carolyn Batts-Gowins
Portable AC Power Supply With Multiple Uses
Serial No. 10/718,437; Filing Date November 20, 2003
Response to Office Action of May 5, 2005
Examiner: Patel, Rajnikant B.; Group Art Unit No. 2838

reference to the relevant column or page number(s) and line number(s) where appropriate, (B) the difference or differences in the claim over the applied reference(s), (C) the proposed modification of the applied reference(s) necessary to arrive at the claimed subject matter, and (D) an explanation why one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to make the proposed modification. MPEP § 706.02(j).

Specifically, for the Examiner to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, there must be a reason, suggestion, or motivation in the prior art, for combining the teachings of the references to produce the claimed invention. MPEP § 2143.01. The prior art as a whole must, therefore, contain some implicit or explicit reason, suggestion or motivation for a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine or modify the references.

Applicant respectfully argues that Examiner has not met his burden as set forth in the MPEP, *supra*, because the prior art references do not teach or suggest every claim limitation. Neither Prelec et al. nor Crass et al., when applied to Claim 1 above, disclose, claim, or suggest "a safety interrupt device connected to the 110 V outlet which can cut off the 110 V outlet whenever a short circuit is detected." (Claim 1).

Here, the Examiner admits that Prelec does not disclose the utilization of the technique for a clock circuit and the LED display and a timer. Although it does appear that the Crass, (U.S. Pat. No. 6,252,378, col. 3, lns. 46-48) device teaches the utilization of a similar technique for a clock circuit and the LED display and a timer, there is nothing in Crass that teaches, suggests or even hints at the fact that it be combined with the Prelec device.

Absent some teaching or suggestion supporting the combination, obviousness cannot be established. *See Fitch*, 23 U.S.P.Q.2d at 1786.

Under section 103, teachings of references can be combined only if there is some suggestion or incentive to do so.... The mere fact that the prior art may be modified in the manner suggested by the Examiner does not make

Inventor: Ms. Carolyn Batts-Gowins
Portable AC Power Supply With Multiple Uses
Serial No. 10/718,437; Filing Date November 20, 2003
Response to Office Action of May 5, 2005
Examiner: Patel, Rajnikant B.; Group Art Unit No. 2838

the modification obvious unless the prior art suggested the desirability of the modification. *Id.*; *In re Bond*, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566, 1568 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

It would not be obvious for a person of ordinary skill to combine the Prelec device with the Crass device to modify the Prelec device for the purpose of increasing efficiency of the device. Because there was no suggestion or teaching supporting the combination of the Prelec et al. and Crass patents, obviousness cannot be established.

Overall, the Prelec and Crass patents do not disclose, claim, or suggest the device of Claim 1. Because a claim limitation of the present invention, found in claim 1, is not taught or suggested by the prior art references, nor is there any support to combine them, Applicant submits that Claim 1 is distinguishable from the prior art references and is patentable.

Claim 2 should not be rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prelec et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,793,185) in combination with Crass et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,252,378). Specifically, for the Examiner to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, there must be a reason, suggestion, or motivation in the prior art, for combining the teachings of the references to produce the claimed invention. MPEP § 2143.01. The prior art as a whole must, therefore, contain some implicit or explicit reason, suggestion or motivation for a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine or modify the references.

Applicant respectfully submits that Examiner has not met his burden as set forth in the MPEP, *supra*, because the prior art references do not teach or suggest every claim limitation. Neither Prelec nor Crass, when applied to Claim 2 above, disclose, claim, or suggest "a 12 V outlet capable of receiving a first connector and a jumper cable having a corresponding second connector for communicating with the device at one end and a car adapter connector at the other end of the cable ." (Claim 2).

Inventor: Ms. Carolyn Batts-Gowins
Portable AC Power Supply With Multiple Uses
Serial No. 10/718,437; Filing Date November 20, 2003
Response to Office Action of May 5, 2005
Examiner: Patel, Rajnikant B.; Group Art Unit No. 2838

There is nothing in Crass that teaches, suggests or even hints at the fact that it be combined with the Prelec device. Absent some teaching or suggestion supporting the combination, obviousness cannot be established. See *Fitch*, 23 U.S.P.Q.2d at 1786.

Under section 103, teachings of references can be combined only if there is some suggestion or incentive to do so.... The mere fact that the prior art may be modified in the manner suggested by the Examiner does not make the modification obvious unless the prior art suggested the desirability of the modification. *Id.*; *In re Bond*, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566, 1568 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

It would not be obvious for a person of ordinary skill to combine the Prelec device with the Crass or Johnson devices to produce the device of Claim 2. Because there was no suggestion or teaching supporting the combination of the Prelec and Crass patents to create a device that has "a 12 V outlet capable of receiving a first connector and a jumper cable having a corresponding second connector for communicating with the device at one end and a car adapter connector at the other end of the cable" (Claim 2), obviousness cannot be established.

Overall, the Prelec and Crass patents do not disclose, claim, or suggest the device of Claim 2. Because a claim limitation of the present invention, found in claim 2, is not taught or suggested by the prior art references, nor is there any support to combine them, Applicant submits that Claim 2 is patentably distinguishable from the prior art references.

Claim 4 should not be rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prelec (U.S. Pat. No. 5,793,185) in combination with Crass (U.S. Pat. No. 6,252,378). Applicant respectfully submits that Examiner has not met his burden as set forth in the MPEP, *supra*, because the prior art references do not teach or suggest every claim limitation. Neither Prelec nor Crass, when applied to claim 4 above, disclose, claim, or suggest "a 12 V outlet capable of receiving a first connector and a jumper cable having a corresponding second connector for communicating with the device and a car adapter receptacle at the other end of the device

Inventor: Ms. Carolyn Batts-Gowins
Portable AC Power Supply With Multiple Uses
Serial No. 10/718,437; Filing Date November 20, 2003
Response to Office Action of May 5, 2005
Examiner: Patel, Rajnikant B.; Group Art Unit No. 2838

wherein a car adapter plug can communicate with the device to provide power to a cell phone anywhere" (Claim 4). Furthermore, the AC power supply can easily convert the 12 Volts from a vehicle's battery into 110 Volts for use with standard household appliances such as a TV, radio or CD player. Neither of the devices in the Prelec (U.S. Pat. No. 5,793,185) and Crass (U.S. Pat. No. 6,252,378) patents are for use with standard household appliances, as is the present invention. The device disclosed in the Prelec patent relates to "electrical jump starters for engines with dead batteries and to engine battery chargers." (U.S. Pat. No. 5,793,185 col. 1, Ins. 4-5). The device disclosed in the Crass patent relates to "determining the cycle of battery or power packs of the rechargeable type for jump starting automotive vehicles" (U.S. Pat. No. 6,252,378, col. 1, Ins. 11-15).

Overall, the Prelec and Crass patents do not disclose, claim, or suggest the device of Claim 4. Because a claim limitation of the present invention, found in claim 4, is not taught or suggested by the prior art references, nor is there any support to combine them, Applicant submits that Claim 4 is distinguishable from the prior art references and is patentable.

3.) Claim 1 is not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prelec (U.S. Pat. No. 5,793,185) in combination with Crass (U.S. Pat. No. 6,252,378), and further in combination with Johnson (U.S. Pat. No. 5,111,127). Specifically, for the Examiner to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, there must be a reason, suggestion, or motivation in the prior art, for combining the teachings of the references to produce the claimed invention. MPEP § 2143.01. The prior art as a whole must, therefore, contain some implicit or explicit reason, suggestion or motivation for a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine or modify the references.

Absent some teaching or suggestion supporting the combination, obviousness cannot be established. See *Fitch*, 23 U.S.P.Q.2d at 1786.

Inventor: Ms. Carolyn Batts-Gowins
Portable AC Power Supply With Multiple Uses
Serial No. 10/718,437; Filing Date November 20, 2003
Response to Office Action of May 5, 2005
Examiner: Patel, Rajnikant B.; Group Art Unit No. 2838

Under § 103, teachings of references can be combined only if there is some suggestion or incentive to do so. The mere fact that the prior art may be modified in the manner suggested by the Examiner does not make the modification obvious unless the prior art suggested the desirability of the modification. *Id.*; *In re Bond*, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566, 1568 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Regarding the Prelec and Crass patents, claim 1 is not obvious for the same reasons mentioned above, namely, that there is no suggestion, teaching or motivation mentioned in Prelec and Crass to make such a design modification in accordance with *Fitch*, and further it is not seen or taught in any of the prior art, nor is it even hinted at. There is nothing in Prelec or Crass or that teaches, suggests or even hints at the fact that they can be combined with the Johnson device.

The device disclosed in the Johnson patent is a bulky power supply used to power tools at remote location around a job site. The Johnson device uses a DC rechargeable battery which is equipped with an DC to AC converter which can function as a 110 V AC current supply. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,111,127, col. 3, lns. 52-57). The AC power supply of the present invention does not result from the use of an inverter/converter unit to convert DC power to AC power. Furthermore, the present invention consists of a lightweight portable AC power supply that can be powered by a NiCad or similar rechargeable battery.

Neither Prelec, Crass, nor Johnson when applied to claim 1 above, disclose, claim, or suggest "a safety interrupt device connected to the 110 V outlet which can cut off the 110 V outlet whenever a short circuit is detected." (Claim 1). Applicant respectfully submits that Examiner has not met his burden as set forth in the MPEP, *supra*, because the prior art references do not teach or suggest every claim limitation. Because a claim limitation of the present invention, found in claim 1, is not taught or suggested by the prior art references, it is clear that this claim is patentable.

Claim 2 is not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prelec

Inventor: Ms. Carolyn Batts-Gowins
Portable AC Power Supply With Multiple Uses
Serial No. 10/718,437; Filing Date November 20, 2003
Response to Office Action of May 5, 2005
Examiner: Patel, Rajnikant B.; Group Art Unit No. 2838

(U.S. Pat. No. 5,793,185) in combination with Crass (U.S. Pat. No. 6,252,378) and further in combination with Johnson (U.S. Pat. No. 5,111,127). Specifically, for the Examiner to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, there must be a reason, suggestion, or motivation in the prior art, for combining the teachings of the references to produce the claimed invention. MPEP § 2143.01. The prior art as a whole must, therefore, contain some implicit or explicit reason, suggestion or motivation for a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine or modify the references.

Applicant respectfully argues that Examiner has not met her burden as set forth in the MPEP, *supra*, because the prior art references do not teach or suggest every claim limitation. Neither Prelec, Crass, nor Johnson when applied to claim 2 above, disclose, claim, or suggest "a 12 V outlet capable of receiving a first connector and a jumper cable having a corresponding second connector for communicating with the device at one end and a car adapter connector at the other end of the cable" (Claim 2).

Regarding the Prelec and Crass patents, claim 2 is not obvious for the same reasons mentioned above, namely, that there is no suggestion, teaching or motivation mentioned in Prelec and Crass to make such a design modification in accordance with *Fitch*, and further it is not seen or taught in any of the prior art, nor is it even hinted at. There is nothing in Prelec or Crass or that teaches, suggests or even hints at the fact that they can be combined with the Johnson device. Absent some teaching or suggestion supporting the combination, obviousness cannot be established. See *Fitch*, 23 U.S.P.Q.2d at 1786.

Under section 103, teachings of references can be combined only if there is some suggestion or incentive to do so.... The mere fact that the prior art may be modified in the manner suggested by the Examiner does not make the modification obvious unless the prior art suggested the desirability of the modification. *Id.*; *In re Bond*, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566, 1568 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

It would not be obvious for a person of ordinary skill to combine the Prelec device with the

Inventor: Ms. Carolyn Batts-Gowins
Portable AC Power Supply With Multiple Uses
Serial No. 10/718,437; Filing Date November 20, 2003
Response to Office Action of May 5, 2005
Examiner: Patel, Rajnikant B.; Group Art Unit No. 2838

Crass or Johnson devices to produce the device of Claim 2. Because there was no suggestion or teaching supporting the combination of the Prelec et al. and Crass et al. patents to a device having "a 12 V outlet capable of receiving a first connector and a jumper cable having a corresponding second connector for communicating with the device at one end and a car adapter connector at the other end of the cable " (Claim 2), obviousness cannot be established.

Overall, the Prelec, Crass, and Johnson patents do not disclose, claim, or suggest the device of Claim 2. Because a claim limitation of the present invention, found in claim 2, is not taught or suggested by the prior art references, nor is there any support to combine them, Applicant submits that Claim 2 is not obvious to one skilled in the art from the prior art references and is patentable.

Claim 3 is not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prelec (U.S. Pat. No. 5,793,185) in combination with Crass (U.S. Pat. No. 6,252,378) and further in combination with Johnson (U.S. Pat. No. 5,111,127) for the same reasons mentioned above, namely, that there is no suggestion, teaching or motivation mentioned in Prelec, Crass nor Johnson to make such a design modification in accordance with *Fitch*, and further it is not seen or taught in any of the prior art, nor is it even hinted at. There is nothing in Crass or Johnson that teaches, suggests or even hints at the fact that they can be combined with the Prelec device. Applicant respectfully submits that Examiner has not met his burden as set forth in the MPEP, *supra*, because the prior art references do not teach or suggest every claim limitation.

Neither Prelec, Crass, nor Johnson when applied to Claim 3 above, disclose, claim, or suggest "a low voltage outlet capable of receiving a first connector and a jumper cable having a corresponding second connector for communicating with the device at one end and a solar panel unit connected to the other end of the cable wherein the jumper cable can be used to recharge the electrical distribution device" (Claim 3). Furthermore, although Johnson teaches the use of "four

Inventor: Ms. Carolyn Batts-Gowins
Portable AC Power Supply With Multiple Uses
Serial No. 10/718,437; Filing Date November 20, 2003
Response to Office Action of May 5, 2005
Examiner: Patel, Rajnikant B.; Group Art Unit No. 2838

photoelectric panels" (U.S. Pat. No. 5,111,127, col. 2, lns. 46-47), the solar panels of this device do not have a jumper cable attached as does the present invention.

Although, it does appear that the Johnson (U.S. Pat. No. 5,111,127, col. 2, lns. 46-47) device teaches the utilization of a similar technique for a solar panel unit, there is nothing in Johnson that teaches, suggests or even hints at the fact that it may be combined with the Prelec and the Crass devices. Absent some teaching or suggestion supporting the combination, obviousness cannot be established. See *Fitch*, 23 U.S.P.Q.2d at 1786.

Under section 103, teachings of references can be combined only if there is some suggestion or incentive to do so.... The mere fact that the prior art may be modified in the manner suggested by the Examiner does not make the modification obvious unless the prior art suggested the desirability of the modification. *Id.*; *In re Bond*, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566, 1568 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

It would not be obvious for a person of ordinary skill to combine the Johnson device with the Prelec and Crass devices to modify the Johnson device for the purpose of saving electricity and increasing battery life. Because there was no suggestion or teaching supporting the combination of the Johnson, Prelec, and Crass patents, obviousness cannot be established.

Overall, the Prelec et al., Crass et al. and Johnson patents do not disclose, claim, or suggest the device of Claim 3. Because a claim limitation of the present invention, found in claim 3 is not taught or suggested by the prior art references, nor is there any support to combine them, Applicant believes that Claim 3 is distinguishable from the prior art references and is patentable.

Claim 5 should not be rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prelec et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,793,185) in combination with Crass et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,252,378) and further in combination with Johnson (U.S. Pat. No. 5,111,127). Applicant respectfully argues that Examiner has not met her burden as set forth in the MPEP, *supra*, because the prior art references do not teach or suggest every claim limitation. Neither Prelec, Crass nor Johnson, when

Inventor: Ms. Carolyn Batts-Gowins
Portable AC Power Supply With Multiple Uses
Serial No. 10/718,437; Filing Date November 20, 2003
Response to Office Action of May 5, 2005
Examiner: Patel, Rajnikant B.; Group Art Unit No. 2838

applied to claim 5 above, disclose, claim, or suggest "the electrical distribution device according to Claim 1 wherein 2 or more such devices are provided, each having at least one physical interconnecting means communicating with its housing and at least two electrical connector means, wherein when the 2 or more electrical distribution devices are joined with their respective physical connecting means joined together and their electrical connector means are also joined together additional power and/or battery life may be provided from all of the electrical distribution devices which have been joined together" (Claim 5).

There is nothing in Johnson that teaches, suggests or even hints at the fact that it should be combined with the Prelec and the Crass devices. Absent some teaching or suggestion supporting the combination, obviousness cannot be established. See *Fitch*, 23 U.S.P.Q.2d at 1786.

Under section 103, teachings of references can be combined only if there is some suggestion or incentive to do so.... The mere fact that the prior art may be modified in the manner suggested by the Examiner does not make the modification obvious unless the prior art suggested the desirability of the modification. *Id.*; *In re Bond*, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566, 1568 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

It would not be obvious for a person of ordinary skill to combine the Johnson device with the Prelec and Crass devices to modify the Johnson device for the purpose of providing additional power and/or battery life from all of the electrical distribution device that have been joined together. Because there was no suggestion or teaching supporting the combination of the Johnson, Prelec and Crass patents, obviousness cannot be established.

Overall, the Prelec, Crass, and Johnson patents do not disclose, claim, or suggest the device of Claim 5. Because a claim limitation of the present invention, found in claim 5, is not taught or suggested by the prior art references, nor is there any support to combine them, Applicant believes that Claim 4 is distinguishable from the prior art references and is patentable.